DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 072 SO 010 675

AUTHOR Schwerin, Karl H.
TITLE Behavioral Values and Family Structure in American Society.
PUB DATE Apr 77
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Anthropological Association (San Diego, California, April 6-9, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Extended Family; *Family (Sociological Unit); Family Attitudes; Family Characteristics; Family Income; Family Influence; *Family Involvement; Family Life; *Family Relationship; *Family Structure; Group Relations; Human Relations; Middle Class; Middle Class College Students; *Middle Class Values; Social Behavior; Social Values; Sociology; *Values

ABSTRACT

Looking at holiday observances and patterns of contact and interaction among kinsmen, this paper examines the values middle class people hold about both close and distant kinsmen and investigates how consistent their actual behavioral patterns are to these expressed values. A questionaire was constructed and administered to a class of predominantly undergraduate students. Thirty-nine students responded to the questionaire; 26 of the respondents were male, 13 were female. The ages ranged from 19 and 28, with the mean age being 22.4 years. Within this sample, the nuclear family continues to retain primacy. Also, extended family ties are maintained by a significant minority of the sample. Extended ties are not important in the context of daily activities, but are for holidays and special ceremonial occasions. A more restricted range of extended kin is also included in practices of gift exchange, telephone contact, and correspondence. Kin ties are maintained with approximately equal members of maternal and paternal kin. The sample was small and from a select population; what is needed now is to test these findings with a larger random sample drawn from the general population. (Author/JK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED150072

paper presented at the
Annual Meeting of the
Southwestern Anthropological Assn.
April 6-9, 1977. San Diego, Calif.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Karl H. Schwerin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

BEHAVIORAL VALUES AND FAMILY STRUCTURE IN AMERICAN SOCIETY

Karl H. Schwerin
University of New Mexico

Sociologists have long stressed the importance of the nuclear family in American society and have emphasized that not only is it the dominant family form, but that the values and behavior attached to it permeate the society (Parsons 1943). Growing up in California, I seemed to find confirmation of this in my own experience, as kin ties beyond the nuclear family seemed tenuous and intermittent. Yet it gradually became apparent that at a basic level there is considerable tenacity in these ties. Holidays are a time for extended family gatherings. Sporadic contact is maintained with a broad range of midwestern relatives, and there is an occasional gathering in of the extended family on occasions of life crisis. Once every 10 to 25 years there might be a family reunion where even distant relatives engage in a familial rite of intensification. The nuclear family may well be predominant, but clearly more extensive kin ties continue to retain some significance over long periods of time and considerable dispersal in space.

In the last 10 to 20 years, social research has begun to qualify the picture of a monolithic nuclear family dominating kin and domestic relations throughout American society. The first questions were raised by Young and Wilmott (1957) who showed, in their study of East London working class families, how maintenance of extended family ties was important both affectively and economically. More recent investigations in the United States have confirmed that similar arrangements occur among lower class groups in this country (Adams 1968). Reports by Moynihan (1965) and Stack (1974)

SP010675

have shown how extended kin ties become particularly important among blacks, where the nuclear family, as ordinarily defined, is often absent.

The upper classes and the wealthy have not been as exhaustively studied by social scientists, but there are indications that here too there is a tendency to maintain stronger extended family ties. Economic considerations are probably just as important here, since it would be advantageous to maintain a clear claim on family investments and wealth.

Is primacy of the nuclear family then a wholly middle class phenomenon? Perhaps. But is it also possible that we have so concentrated our attention on the characteristics of the nuclear family that we have overlooked other important aspects of middle class kinship and family organization? With this latter question in mind, I decided to investigate holiday observances, occasions of life crisis, and patterns of contact and interaction among kinsmen, in order to determine what values middle class people hold about both close and distant kinsmen and how consistent their actual behavioral patterns are to these expressed values.

A questionnaire was constructed and administered to a class of predominantly undergraduate students in order to gain some preliminary insights on the kind of responses which might be expected, and to determine whether or not my intuitions about extended family ties could be supported by more extensive data. This paper represents a report on the findings from that class. While the sample is clearly too small and select to provide definitive interpretations, the results are both interesting and suggestive. They definitely suggest that the orthodox view of the American family may be overly simplistic, and that it may be necessary to elaborate a model which allows for more extensive structures and their associated behavioral patterns.

The Sample

Thirty-nine students responded to the questionnaire; most were undergraduates (6 graduates), and the majority were anthropology majors (22), with another nine in the behavioral and biological sciences. The rest were scattered through a variety of other majors (Table 1). Nor was there any consistency in their geographic background. Eight had their homes in New Mexico, but the rest came from various parts of the country--both coasts as well as the Midwest.

Twenty-six of the respondents were male, 13 were female. All were in the stage of early adulthood, with ages ranging between 19 and 28. The majority (27) were between 20 and 23, with the mean age being 22.4 years (Table 3). Only six of the respondents were married, and two of these had been married less than two months; three, however, had been married six years. One respondent was divorced. A clear bias is inherent in this sample, since it is drawn from a group which is still in the process of establishing its independence from the family of orientation and has not yet acquired commitments to spouse, in-laws, children, much less become involved with business or professional associates, property ownership, or other aggregates of the established middle class family. Certainly one may expect that kin ties, whether extended or close, will tend to be less important at this time of life than almost any other. Thus any evidence for extended kin ties which does emerge can be taken as being more significant than it appears in this context.

The majority of these students (28) had incomes of under $3000 per year; only five reported making more than that amount. Yet they came from comfortable backgrounds. Twenty-four reported that their parents make more than $10,000 per year, eight were making between $5000 and $10,000 per year,

and only four were between $3000 and $5000 annual income (Table 4). By and large, the fathers were identified as business and professional men (21), or at least white collar (5). Only nine were identified as employed in service or labor occupations. The remaining four were either retired, deceased, or unreported. Most mothers are housewives, but 16 either have business or professional careers, or hold white collar positions.

Most of the students (29) identified their families as Anglo, five as Chicano, four as Jewish. This was a rather a-religious group, as 21 indicated no religious identification. Nearly equal numbers identified themselves as Protestant (7), Jewish (6), and Roman Catholic (4)(one Mystic).[1]

Of the 39 respondents, 15 are the eldest child in their family, 10 are the youngest, and six are only children. Twenty-two reported having either one or two siblings, and eight have three (Table 2).

Ten of the respondents indicated that they were currently living with relatives. Five were living with their family of orientation, one male and one female were living with their mother, a female shared an apartment with her brother, and a male was living with his sister and her husband. There was only one instance of residence with a secondary relative--a male who was living with his mother's brother. In addition, one male reported that his grandmother lived with <u>him</u> because she was afraid to live alone. The predominant reason offered for living with relatives was financial. Nine offered this as the primary reason, although two of these indicated that affective considerations were also involved. One gave no reason. Since financial considerations are so important in these arrangements, it is not surprising that payment for room and board is generally rather informal. Where anything at all is contributed it involves either help with household chores, or payment of merely token sums.

Holiday Behavior

The questionnaire asked respondents to identify all relatives who usually gather together to celebrate a variety of religious and secular holidays. In this particular sample Thanksgiving turned out to be a slightly more important holiday than Christmas, with 33 reporting family gatherings for the former, and 32 for the latter (Table 5). Slightly more kinsmen come together in observance of Thanksgiving as well. Eleven individuals reported gatherings of 10 or more kinsmen, with the mean number being 8.0. For Christmas only nine reported gatherings of 10 or more, while the mean is 7.3. These characteristics are undoubtedly a bias of this particular sample, in which seven Jewish families are represented. All but one of these observe Thanksgiving,[2] but none of course observes Christmas. Hanukkah observances would add six more families, but with somewhat smaller gatherings, the mean number of relatives in attendance being 5.3.

New Year is another relatively important holiday, with 28 reporting family gatherings. These are smaller, however, with only three instances of 10 or more relatives getting together; the mean group size on this occasion is only 5.8. Yom Kippur is the most important Jewish holiday; all seven Jewish respondents indicate family gatherings on this occasion, with the average number of kinsmen being 6.3.

Other holidays are much less important in bringing together family members. For Easter 22 reported family get-togethers, for the 4th of July there were 18, for Memorial Day 14, and for Labor Day 13. Few of these gatherings numbered as many as 10, and the mean on all occasions fell between 5.1 and 6.1.

While holidays, particularly those around the end of the year, prove to be important in bringing together dispersed family members, it is even

more interesting to examine the composition of the groups which meet on these occasions. As is to be expected, there is a high proportion of nuclear family groupings, but their incidence is in inverse proportion to the importance of the holiday. For Thanksgiving and Christmas they constitute only 30 to 38 per cent of the gatherings, whereas on Memorial Day 71 per cent of the gatherings are made up of nuclear family members. In addition, one can recognize family gatherings which result from the extension of nuclear family ties by a single step, such as including one or more married children and their spouse and children (designated filial here), or where siblings meet together in the absence of their parents (designated joint). These add an additional six filial cases for Thanksgiving, three joint and four filial cases for Christmas, one joint and two filial cases for New Year, one joint case for Hanukkah, three cases for Easter (1 joint, two filial), two for the 4th of July (one each), one filial for Memorial Day, and one of each for Labor Day. Again we see a declining significance for these holidays which parallels the general pattern.

One striking pattern which emerges is a strong matrilateral bias in holiday get togethers. On Thanksgiving one-third of all gatherings (11 cases) involve a greater or lesser number of maternal kinsmen. The same pattern is repeated on Christmas, although the number declines to seven (22 per cent). Addition of one matrilaterally biased family gathering for Hanukkah does not significantly change the percentage representation. For other holidays the proportion of matrilaterally biased family celebrations fluctuates from 7.1 per cent on Memorial Day (one case) to 23 per cent (5 cases) on Easter. Two such gatherings were also reported for Yom Kippur. Because these groups are defined somewhat more broadly, they include larger gatherings of kinsmen, with the mean number of individuals ranging from 7.5 on New Year to 11.0 on

Christmas. While this clearly represents a minority behavioral pattern, it appears to be significant both in terms of its proportional representation, and because of the larger numbers of kinsmen who are maintaining contact. One would expect to find family and kin ties to be stronger within these groups than among any other structural type that has been identified here.

Other structural types do emerge from the data, but none seem particularly important. Certainly their significance is far less than those already discussed. A bias towards paternal kinsmen is relatively rare, and represented by only one or two cases in this sample. There is also one instance where most holidays are celebrated with the spouse's kin. Bilateral gatherings are slightly more frequent, representing two to five cases (12 to 15 per cent) on most occasions. It is interesting that no bilateral gatherings were reported for the Jewish holidays. Again, bilateral get-togethers tend to be larger than average, with about nine kinsmen participating on a typical occasion.

Finally, it should be noted that it is rare to find an individual observing one holiday with one class of relatives, and spending another holiday with another class. What seems to happen instead, is that more important holidays are celebrated with a larger group of kinsmen, more peripheral members of this group tend to be sloughed off for the observance of lesser holidays.

A parallel pattern is to be observed with respect to the exchange of Christmas gifts (Table 6). Almost everyone is involved in Christmas gift exchange (only two indicated that they receive no gifts, and four that they give none). For the most part, respondents receive gifts from fewer people than gather to observe Christmas, and they give gifts to even less. Here, however, bilateral ties become more significant. More than one third (13)

of those exchanging gifts receive gifts from a range of kinsmen on both sides of the family, the mean number of relatives providing Christmas gifts being 8.9. A slightly smaller number reports gifts from primarily within the nuclear family (12, mean number of gift givers 2.9), and considerably fewer from maternal relatives alone (7, mean number of gift givers 5.8).

Reciprocity is somewhat diminished in the sample group. Only eight return gifts on a bilateral basis (to a mean of 8.4 kinsmen). The remainder apparently return gifts only within the nuclear family; there were 18 reports of giving gifts to a mean of 3.8 nuclear family members. The pattern of diminished gift giving on the part of respondents may reflect their current condition of relatively limited income. Yet the pattern of exchange with primarily matrilateral relatives remains nearly constant, with six respondents giving gifts to a mean of 6.0 maternal kinsmen. The consistency between receiving and giving gifts in matrilaterally biased families reinforces my earlier inference that these represent well integrated groups with strong family ties.

Nonetheless, the frequency of bilateral extension in patterns of gift exchange indicates that affective ties remain important among both maternal and paternal kin. Whether they tend to remain stronger on one side than the other, or whether the matrilateral bias is merely an artifact of differential geographic mobility or residence patterns is something which cannot be resolved with the data from this survey.

Birthdays

Questions were also included concerning the behavior associated with observance of birthdays. Birthdays are much more personal than religious and secular holidays, yet over half of the respondents make no attempt at birthday observance with kinsmen. Furthermore, they seem to involve less elaborate observance. Only 19 respondents indicated that they make any effort to invite kinsmen to join in celebrating birthdays (Table 7). Twelve of these limit such invitations to three or four members (range 2 - 6) of their immediate nuclear family, although married siblings and their families may also be included. Three tend to invite additional relatives from the mother's side and three more include a bilateral selection of kinsmen. In these latter cases twice as many relatives (7) are involved than when invitations are limited to nuclear family members alone.

As a measure of affect felt by other kinsmen toward the respondents, the latter were asked to identify other relatives who usually call or visit without invitation on their birthday. Thirteen indicated they could expect one or more relatives to give this kind of spontaneous recognition to the event. Again, most (6) expected acknowledgment only from (1-4) other members of the nuclear family. Two, however, expected contact from (1-2) additional paternal relatives, and two from (1-3) other maternal kinsmen. Three more expected to hear from 5 - 10 kinsmen on either side of the family.

Exchange of birthday gifts seems to be a more tenacious custom than formal observance of the date. All but three respondents expect to give and/or receive birthday gifts (Table 7). The greater proportion (18) will expect gifts from a few (mean 3.2) nuclear family members only. However, better than one fourth (11) will receive gifts from other kinsmen related

bilaterally, here again there are more persons involved, the mean being 7.0. Finally, five indicated a matrilateral bias in the relatives from whom they might expect birthday gifts.

Since this sample is composed of young persons with limited income, it is not at all surprising that their pattern of presenting gifts on the occasion of other relatives' birthdays is somewhat restricted. Two thirds (26) only give gifts to an average of 3.3 members of their own nuclear family. However, seven others do extend their gift-giving to other relatives on one or both sides of the family. Only those (3) with a matrilateral bias include significantly more relatives (7.3) in their pattern of giving; again reaffirming the strength of integration which characterizes matrilaterally biased families.

Patterns of Contact

Another way of looking at the strength of family and kin ties is to examine the frequency of contact among relatives. The questionnaire investigated the frequency with which several categories of kinsmen are reached by telephone or through correspondence.

Nearly two thirds (24) of the respondents felt they should call their parents from one to four times (weekly) per month (Table 8). Most of these actually do call one or more times per month, although no one telephones every day. There is a tendency for people to call less frequently than they think they should. Seven in fact showed marked inconsistency between how often they thought they <u>should</u> call and how often they <u>actually do</u>. On the other hand, four actually call <u>more often</u> than they think they should. This frequency of telephone contact seems to represent fairly strong affective ties.

Weaker ties are probably represented by the nine individuals who feel they should and/or actually do telephone their parents once (2) or twice (2) a year, or only on special occasions (4 + 3).

Telephone contact with siblings is much less frequent. Only nine feel that they should call a brother or sister one or more times per month, only five actually do so. Sixteen feel they should telephone siblings once or twice a year, or at least on special occasions, and 17 report that they actually do so. Again there are some who call less frequently than they think they should, four of these never do. Four more may be added who feel they never need to call. On the basis of these responses, sibling ties definitely appear less strong than parental ties.

Turning to the grandparental generation, it is hard to see that there are significant differences in affective feelings between the two sets of grandparents, consequently separate responses for each set are analyzed together here. About half of those who still have living grandparents feel that they ought to be called only on special occasions (24; 14 MoPa + 10 FaPa), while only a half dozen (5 MoPa, 7 FaPa) feel no need to telephone at all. Very few feel they should call on a regular schedule of once or twice a year (5 MoPa, 3 FaPa). As with parents and siblings, the frequency of actual calls to grandparents is slightly lower than the ideal. The number of those who never actually call increases to about one fourth (MoPa 10, FaPa 12). For FaPa it is actually double (12) the number of those called on special occasions (6). Nonetheless, due to differential mortality between maternal and paternal grandparents, it is difficult to draw any definite conclusions about matrilateral or patrilateral biases from this set of data.

Six respondents indicate that they call at least one other relative frequently. Mostly these are secondary relatives, and they seem to be distributed about equally between maternal and paternal kin. Ten respondents, however, report occasionally calling one or two other relatives. These are almost all secondary (8) and tertiary (7) kin, and here a clear matrilateral bias emerges, being evident in six out of the ten cases (3 patrilateral, one nuclear).

Habits of correspondence with relatives may be seen as partially complementary with telephone contact. There is an equal division (9 each) among those who feel they should write their parents weekly, twice a month, or once a month (Table 9). In all, 31 (80 per cent) think they should write their parents once every two months or oftener. Twenty-two of these report that they do write one to four or more letters every two months. Only four feel that they ought to write their parents as infrequently as every six months, or on special occasions; six indicate that this represents their actual frequency of correspondence. Finally, two feel that it is never requisite to write to their parents, and seven report that they never do.

Most respondents feel that they ought to correspond with siblings almost as frequently as with parents, 25 think they should write every two months or oftener. However, only one fourth (10) actually do so. Most of these "backsliders" do write once or twice a year or on special occasions (16). The number who never write to siblings (8) is not significantly different from those who do not write their parents (7).

Looking at grandparents, it is again difficult to discern significant differences in patterns of correspondence between maternal and paternal sets. Most of those who have living grandparents believe that one ought to correspond with them. They are about evenly split, however, between limiting

this to special occasions (8 FaPa + 9 MoPa), or writing two or more times a year (8 FaPa + 11 MoPa). Somewhat fewer write as often as they think they should, but the distribution parallels the ideal, except for a lesser tendency to write paternal grandparents on a regular basis; letters to them seem to be reserved for special occasions. There is also an increase in the number who believe they need never write to their grandparents (7 FaPa + 6 MoPa), and in those who report that they never do (12 + 12).

Five individuals report that they also correspond <u>frequently</u> with one to three other relatives--all secondary or tertiary in relationship (particularly cousins). This compares with 16 who <u>occasionally</u> write to other kinsmen. The majority (9) have only one other distant kin correspondent, but there are two who write to three other kinsmen and two who write to four. Correspondents are almost equally divided between secondary (14) and more distant kin (15). There is a definite matrilateral bias (8 cases) among the kin to whom these individuals write, five show a patrilateral bias, and three report a bilateral selection of kin.

In both writing and telephoning there seems to be little inclination to leave the initiative for making contact to the other person. No more than one or two individuals indicated that they would wait for a relative in any category to call or write first. While patterns of kin interaction are much the same in both telephone contact and correspondence, letter writing seems to be a much less consistent activity. There is greater divergence between how frequently people feel they ought to correspond and how often they actually do. There also seems to be a greater tendency to exclude certain relatives from the circle of kin to whom letters are written. In some instances correspondence with distant kin is more frequent than with those who are closer.

Calling a person by telephone can be a spontaneous act, and may consequently provide an easy way to discharge one's "obligations" to kin and others. Letter writing takes time and thought, particularly because it commits one to a more or less permanent record which can be reread and pondered by the recipient. Consequently, letter writing may more accurately reflect the real strength of those bonds of common interest, empathy, or emotion which exist between two individuals, and which may to a considerable extent exist independently of formal kin ties.[3]

Conclusions

Due to limitations of time and space, data relating to life crises will not be presented here. Preliminary analysis indicates, however, that bilateral kin ties are significant for a majority of individuals. Although they may remain dormant over long periods of time, they seem to be reactivated on the occasion of weddings and funerals. Other events of lesser significance, such as the birth of a child or graduation from high school also tend to be communicated bilaterally, even though large numbers of kin and more distant kin rarely participate directly on these occasions.

Within this sample it is evident that the nuclear family continues to retain primacy. It is also clear, however, that extended family ties are maintained by a significant minority of the sample. Extended ties are not important in the context of ordinary or daily activities, but they are regularly activated for holidays and special ceremonial occasions. Within this minority a more restricted range of extended kin is also included in practises of gift exchange, telephone contact, and correspondence.

Although the American kinship system is bilateral, there is a clear matrilateral bias here in behavioral interactions with extended kin. A patrilateral bias is almost wholly non-existent. This apparent bias may

be somewhat misleading, however, for when it is a matter of maintaining contact or otherwise recognizing kin ties without direct face to face interaction, it becomes evident that kin ties are maintained with approximately equal numbers of maternal and paternal kin. In other words, bilateral kin ties do seem to be important, but on a less intense level than matrilateral ties. These in turn seem to be less intense than ties among members of the nuclear family. Thus kin relations seem to function on several different levels, with different types of behavior associated with each level.

The sample which was analyzed here was small and drawn from a very select population. The values expressed by the respondents and the kinship structures correlated with them are most suggestive. Since the sample is young and has few responsibilities at this stage, their kinship ties may actually be more restricted than would be true in the general population. What is needed now is to test these findings with a larger random sample drawn from the general population.

Notes

1. Two who indicated a Jewish religious preference identified their families as "Eastern Anglo."
2. This one, in fact, celebrates no family holidays except Yom Kippur.
3. Foster (1961) offers a similar argument in his characterization of the dyadic contract. He shows how individuals selectively develop only a few significant working relationships out of the range of formal family, compadrazgo, neighborhoodship, and friendship ties.

Bibliography

Adams, Bert N. 1968. Kinship in an urban setting. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co.

Foster, George M. 1961. The Dyadic Contract: A Model for the Social Structure of a Mexican Peasant Village. American Anthropologist 63: 1173-1192.

Moynihan, Daniel P. 1965. The Negro family: The case for national action, Washington: U.S. Department of Labor

Parsons, Talcott. 1943. The Kinship System of the Contemporary United States. American Anthropologist 45:22-38

Stack, Carol B. 1974. All our kin: Strategies for survival in a Black community. New York: Harper & Row

Young, Michael & Peter Willmott. 1957. Family and kinship in East London. London:

Characteristics of the Sample (No. 39)

Table 1

Academic Characteristics	No.
Majors	
Anthropology	22
Behavioral Sciences	9
Other	8
Class status	
Undergraduate	33
Graduate	6

Table 2

No. of Siblings Reported by each Respondent

No. of Siblings	No. of Respondents
0	6
1	10
2	12
3	8
4	2
10	1

Table 3

Age Distribution

Age	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Number	2	10	7	4	6	3	1	1	1	4

Table 4

Average Yearly Income

	Respondent	Parents
0 - 999	15	1
1000 - 2999	13	--
3000 - 4999	3	4
5000 - 9999	2	8
10,000 - 19,999	--	16
20,000+	--	8
unreported	6	2

Table 5

Types of Family Gatherings on Important Holidays

Holiday	Thanksgiving		Christmas		Hanukkah		New Year		Yom Kippur		Easter		4th July		Memorial Day	
Family type	No.[1]	Mean[2]	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean	No.	Mean
Nuclear	10	4.4	12	4.6	3	4.0	14	4.2	4	3.8	11	4.1	11	4.4	10	4.4
Filial	6	8.8	4	9.3	-	--	2	7.5	-	--	2	6.5	1	5	1	5
Joint	-	--	3	3.7	1	4	1	5	-	--	1	5	1	9	-	--
sub-total	16		19		4	4.0	17		-	--	14		13		11	
Bilateral	5	9.6	4	10.3	-	--	5	7.8	-	--	3	7.3	3	8.7	2	7.5
Matrilateral	11	9.9	7	11.0	1	9	4	7.5	2	11.0	5	8.8	2	11.0	1	11
Patrilateral	1	8	1	5	1	7	2	7.5	1	7	-	--	-	--	-	--
Total gatherings	33	8.0	32	7.3	6	5.3	28	5.8	7	6.3	22	5.9	18	6.1	14	5.4
No gatherings	6	--	7	--	33	--	11	--	32	--	17	--	21	--	25	--

1. Number of cases

2. Mean number of kin included in gathering for that holiday

Table 6

Patterns of Christmas Gift Exchange

Family Type	Christmas Gifts Received from		Christmas Gifts Given to	
	No.[1]	Mean[2]	No.[1]	Mean[2]
Nuclear	8	3.0	12	3.5
Filial	3	6.0	2	5.5
Joint	3	2.3	3	4.0
sub-total	12	2.9	17	3.8
Bilateral	13	8.9	8	5.4
Matrilateral	7	6.3	6	6.0
Patrilateral	3	8.7	2	5.5
Total exchanging gifts	37	6.4	35	5.5
No exchange	2	--	4	--

1. Number of cases

2. Mean number of kin involved in gift exchange

Table 7

Behavior Associated with Birthdays

Family Type	Relatives Invited to		Visited by Relatives		Receive Gift from		Give Gift to	
	No.[1]	Mean[2]	No.[1]	Mean[2]	No.[1]	Mean[2]	No.[1]	Mean[2]
Nuclear	10	3.7	6	2.5	17	3.2	24	3.3
Filial	1	7	-	--	1	4	1	7
Joint	2	5.0	-	--	1	2	2	3.0
sub-total	13		6		19		27	
Bilateral	3	6.7	3	7.0	11	7.0	2	4.5
Matrilateral	3	7.3	2	2.0	5	4.2	3	6.7
Patrilateral	-	--	2	1.5	-	--	1	3
Total	19	4.5	13	3.2	35	4.5	33	3.8
None	20	--	22	--	4	--	6	--

1. Number of cases

2. Mean number of kin involved

Table 8

Frequency of Telephone Calls

	to parents		to siblings		to grandparents[1]	
	should	do	should	do	should	do
twice weekly	1	-	1	1	-	-
weekly	8	6	1	1	-	-
twice a month	8	12	2	1	-	-
monthly	7	4	5	2	1	1
every 2 months	1	2	2	1	-	-
every 6 months	2	2	5	4	6	3
once a year	2	2	1	1	1	1
special occasions	4	3	8	11	24	18
never	2	4	4	8	12	22
they call	-	-	2	1	3	2
not relevant	4	4	8	8	31	31

1 Numbers indicated for grandparents totals 78, or twice the number of respondents

Table 9

Frequency of Letter Writing

	to parents		to siblings		to grandparents[1]	
	should	do	should	do	should	do
weekly	9	5	-	-	1	1
twice a month	9	7	3	1	-	-
monthly	9	4	10	3	6	2
every 2 months	4	6	12	6	11	4
every 6 months	1	3	1	3	1	4
once a year	-	-	1	2	-	-
special occasions	3	3	5	8	17	14
never	2	7	1	8	13	24
they write	-	1	-	2	1	1
not relevant	3	3	6	6	28	28

1 Numbers indicated for grandparents totals 78, or twice the number of respondents